

confidence expectations about anticipated future land use are, in fact, reasonable.

For example, future industrial land use is likely to be a reasonable assumption where a site is currently used for industrial purposes, is located in an area where the surroundings are zoned for industrial use, and the comprehensive plan predicts the site will continue to be used for industrial purposes.

Community Involvement

NPL sites are located in diverse areas of the country, with great variability in land use planning practices. For some NPL sites, the future land use of a site may have been carefully considered through local, public, participatory, planning processes, such as zoning hearings, master plan approvals or other vehicles. When this is the case, local residents around the Superfund site are likely to demonstrate substantial agreement with the local land use planning authority on the future use of the property. Where there is substantial agreement among local residents and land use planning agencies, owners and developers, EPA can rely with a great deal of certainty on the future land use already anticipated for the site. For other NPL sites, however, the absence or nature of a local planning process may yield considerably less certainty about what assumptions regarding future use are reasonable. In some instances the local residents near the Superfund site may feel disenfranchised from the local land use planning and development process. This may be an especially important issue where there are concerns regarding environmental justice in the neighborhood around the NPL site. Consistent with the principle of fairness, EPA should make an extra effort to reach out to the local community to establish appropriate future land use assumptions at such sites.

Land Use Assumptions in the Baseline Risk Assessment

Future land use assumptions allow the baseline risk assessment and the feasibility study to focus on the development of practicable and cost-effective remedial alternatives, leading to site activities which are consistent with the reasonably anticipated future land use.

The baseline risk assessment generally needs only to consider the reasonably anticipated future land use; however, it may be valuable to evaluate risks associated with other land uses. The NCP preamble (55 Fed. Reg. 8710) states that in the baseline risk assessment, more than one future land use assumption may be considered when decision makers wish to understand the implications of unexpected exposures. Especially where there is some uncertainty regarding the anticipated future land use, it may be useful to compare the potential risks associated with several land use scenarios to estimate the impact

on human health and the environment should the land use unexpectedly change. The magnitude of such potential impacts may be an important consideration in determining whether and how institutional controls should be used to restrict future uses. If the baseline risk assessment evaluates a future use under which exposure is limited, it will not serve the traditional role, evaluating a "no action" scenario. A remedy, i.e. institutional controls to limit future exposure, will be required to protect human health and the environment. In addition to analyzing human health exposure scenarios associated with certain land uses, ecological exposures may also need to be considered.

Developing Remedial Action Objectives

Remedial action objectives provide the foundation upon which remedial cleanup alternatives are developed. In general, remedial action objectives should be developed in order to develop alternatives that would achieve cleanup levels associated with the reasonably anticipated future land use over as much of the site as possible. EPA recognizes, however, that achieving either the reasonably anticipated land use, or the land use preferred by the community, may not be practicable across the entire site, or in some cases, at all. For example, as RI/FS data become available, they may indicate that the remedial alternatives under consideration for achieving a level of cleanup consistent with the reasonably anticipated future land use are not cost-effective nor practicable. If this is the case, the remedial action objective may be revised which may result in different, more reasonable land use(s).

EPA's remedy selection expectations described in section 300.430(a)(1)(iii) of the NCP should also be considered when developing remedial action objectives. Where practicable, EPA expects to treat principal threats, to use engineering controls such as containment for low-level threats, to use institutional controls to supplement engineering controls, to consider the use of innovative technology, and to return usable ground waters to beneficial uses to protect human health and the environment. (Some types of applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) define protective cleanup levels which may, in turn, influence post-remediation land use potential.)

In cases where the future land use is relatively certain, the remedial action objective generally should reflect this land use. Generally, it need not include alternative land use scenarios unless, as discussed above, it is impracticable to provide a protective remedy that allows for that use. A landfill site is an example where it is highly likely that the future land use will remain unchanged (i.e., long-term waste management area), given the NCP's expectation that treatment of high volumes of waste generally will be impracticable and the fact that EPA's presumptive remedy for landfills is containment. In such a case,

a remedial action objective could be established with a very high degree of certainty to reflect the reasonably anticipated future land use.

In cases where the reasonably anticipated future land use is highly uncertain, a range of the reasonably likely future land uses should be considered in developing remedial action objectives. These likely future land uses can be reflected by developing a range of remedial alternatives that will achieve different land use potentials. The remedy selection process will determine which alternative is most appropriate for the site and, consequently, the land use(s) available following remediation.

As discussed in "Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions" (OSWER Directive 9355.0-30, April 22, 1991), EPA has established a risk range for carcinogens within which EPA strives to manage site risks. EPA recognizes that a specific cleanup level within the acceptable risk range may be associated with more than one land use (e.g., an industrial cleanup to 10^{-6} may also allow for residential use at a 10^{-4} risk level.) It is not EPA's intent that the risk range be partitioned into risk standards based solely on categories of land use (e.g., with residential cleanups at the 10^{-6} level and industrial cleanups at the 10^{-4} risk level.) Rather, the risk range provides the necessary flexibility to address the technical and cost limitations, and the performance and risk uncertainties inherent in all waste remediation efforts.

Land Use Considerations in Remedy Selection

As a result of the comparative analysis of alternatives with respect to EPA's nine evaluation criteria, EPA selects a site-specific remedy. The remedy determines the cleanup levels, the volume of contaminated material to be treated, and the volume of contaminated material to be contained. Consequently, the remedy selection decision determines the size of the area that can be returned to productive use and the particular types of uses that will be possible following remediation.

The volume and concentration of contaminants left on-site, and thus the degree of residual risk at a site, will affect future land use. For example, a remedial alternative may include leaving in place contaminants in soil at concentrations protective for industrial exposures, but not protective for residential exposures. In this case, institutional controls should be used to ensure that industrial use of the land is maintained and to prevent risks from residential exposures. Conversely, a remedial alternative may result in no waste left in place and allow for unrestricted use (e.g., residential use).

Results of Remedy Selection Process

Several potential land use situations could result from EPA's remedy selection decision. They are:

- The remedy achieves cleanup levels that allow the entire site to be available for the reasonably anticipated future land use in the baseline risk assessment (or, where future land use is uncertain, all uses that could reasonably be anticipated).
- The remedy achieves cleanup levels that allow most, but not all, of the site to be available for the reasonably anticipated future land use. For example, in order to be cost effective and practicable, the remedy may require creation of a long-term waste management area for containment of treatment residuals or low-level waste on a small portion of the site. The cleanup levels in this portion of the site might allow for a more restricted land use.
- The remedy achieves cleanup levels that require a more restricted land use than the reasonably anticipated future land use for the entire site. This situation occurs when no remedial alternative that is cost-effective or practicable will achieve the cleanup levels consistent with the reasonably anticipated future land use. The site may still be used for productive purposes, but the use would be more restricted than the reasonably anticipated future land use. Furthermore, the more restricted use could be a long-term waste management area over all or a portion of the site.

Institutional Controls

If any remedial alternative developed during the FS will require a restricted land use in order to be protective, it is essential that the alternative include components that will ensure that it remain protective. In particular, institutional controls will generally have to be included in the alternative to prevent an unanticipated change in land use that could result in unacceptable exposures to residual contamination, or, at a minimum, alert future users to the residual risks and monitor for any changes in use. In such cases, institutional controls will play a key role in ensuring long-term protectiveness and should be evaluated and implemented with the same degree of care as is given to other elements of the remedy. In developing remedial alternatives that include institutional controls, EPA should determine: the type of institutional control to be used, the existence of the authority to implement the institutional control, and the appropriate entity's resolve and ability to

implement the institutional control. An alternative may anticipate two or more options for establishing institutional controls, but should fully evaluate all such options. A variety of institutional controls may be used such as deed restrictions and deed notices, and adoption of land use controls by a local government. These controls either prohibit certain kinds of site uses or, at a minimum, notify potential owners or land users of the presence of hazardous substances remaining on site at levels that are not protective for all uses. Where exposure must be limited to assure protectiveness, a deed notice alone generally will not provide a sufficiently protective remedy. While the ROD need not always specify the precise type of control to be imposed, sufficient analysis should be shown in the FS and ROD to support a conclusion that effective implementation of institutional controls can reasonably be expected.

Suppose, for example, that a selected remedy will be protective for industrial land use and low levels of hazardous substances will remain on site. An industry may still be able to operate its business with the selected remedy in place. Institutional controls, however, generally will need to be established to ensure the land is not used for other, less restricted purposes, such as residential use, or to alert potential buyers of any remaining contamination.

Future Changes in Land Use

Where waste is left on-site at levels that would require limited use and restricted exposure, EPA will conduct reviews at least every five years to monitor the site for any changes. Such reviews should analyze the implementation and effectiveness of institutional controls with the same degree of care as other parts of the remedy. Should land use change, it will be necessary to evaluate the implications of that change for the selected remedy, and whether the remedy remains protective. EPA's role in any subsequent additional cleanup will be determined on a site-specific basis. If landowners or others decide at a future date to change the land use in such a way that makes further cleanup necessary to ensure protectiveness, CERCLA does not prevent them from conducting such a cleanup as long as protectiveness of the remedy is not compromised. (EPA may invoke CERCLA section 122(e)(6), if necessary, to prevent actions that are inconsistent with the original remedy.) In general, EPA would not expect to become involved actively in the conduct or oversight of such cleanups. EPA, however, retains its authority to take further response action where necessary to ensure protectiveness.

Further Information

If you have any questions concerning this directive, please call Sherri Clark at 703-603-9043.

NOTICE: The policies set out in this memorandum are intended solely as guidance. They are not intended, nor can they be relied upon, to create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States. EPA officials may decide to follow the guidance provided in this memorandum, or to act at variance with the guidance, based on an analysis of specific site circumstances. Remedy selection decisions are made and justified on a case-specific basis. The Agency also reserves the right to change this guidance at any time without public notice.